



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,965	11/13/2001	Thomas Basilio Genduso	RPS920010086US1	3801

7590 08/22/2003

Joseph P. Lally  
DEWAN & LALLY, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 684749  
Austin, TX 78768-4749

EXAMINER

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/008,965

Applicant(s)

GENDUSO ET AL.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the followings must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

- Adapter card (Claims 1-30)
- Contact structures oriented along the longitudinal axis (claims 1-30). The figures show the contact structure along an axis parallel to the longitudinal axis, not along the longitudinal axis.
- Processor (claims 11-20)
- Memory (claims 11-20)
- One bus (claims 11-20)

2. The drawings are objected to because Section line A-A and B-B in Figure 1 should be 3-3 and 2-2. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Furthermore, hatch lines in sectional figures 2, 3, 8 and 10 are not shown.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "107" has been used to designate both surface and guide

(see page 6, lines 3-4). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

5. The following is a quotation of an appropriate paragraph of 37 CFR 1.75:

(d) The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. (See 1.58(a)).

6. Specification is objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d) because the followings have not been described.

- Longitudinal axis of the receptacle perpendicular to a plane defined by an adapter card (claims 1-30).
- Processor, memory, one bus (claims 11-20).

For the purposes of this analysis, the items mentioned above in Items 1 and 5 have been ignored.

### ***Claim Objections***

7. Claims 4 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: "iris" should be changed to -- iris mechanism --. Appropriate correction is required.

8. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: "a receptacle" in line 5 should be changed to -- the receptacle --. Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: "an" in line 3 should be changed to -- the --. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 1-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
12. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the probe contacts" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
13. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the probe contact structures" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
14. Claim 6 recites "a gap defined by the probe cover", which is not clear. A gap is defined by two elements, not a single one.
15. Claim 7 recites "portion the defines" which is not understood.
16. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the probe body contacts" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
17. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the receptacle contacts" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
18. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the adapter" and "the connection" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2839

19. Claim 21 recites the limitation "the adapter" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

20. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the probe contacts" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

21. Claim 21 recites the limitation "the probe contacts" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

22. A number of such errors exist. All claims should be carefully reviewed and amended to avoid such mistakes.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

23. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

24. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ripolone.

Ripolone (Figures 1-3) shows a connector assembly having a receptacle 2 with a plurality of contact structures 15-18 oriented along an axis parallel to a longitudinal axis of the receptacle and engaging a plurality of contact areas 35-38 wherein the receptacle contact structures and probe contact areas are configured to be connected to signals

Art Unit: 2839

and interconnects. The receptacle contact structures are within an interior surface of a housing and the probe contact areas are on an exterior surface of the probe.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claims 3, 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripolone.

Ripolone shows all the features of these claims as describe in Paragraph 24 above except probe guide and notch. Official notice is given that these features are well known in the art of electrical connectors. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide these features because these would provide a means to align the probe with the receptacle as is well known in the art.

27. Claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripolone in view of Cameron.

Ripolone shows all the features of these claims as describe in Paragraph 24 above except an iris mechanism. Such a mechanism is well known in the art as shown by Cameron (Figure 12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide these features because these would

Art Unit: 2839

provide a means to cover/protect the interior of the receptacle as taught by Cameron and well known in the art.

28. Claims 6-10, 16-20 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripolone.

Ripolone shows all the features of these claims as describe in Paragraph 24 above except a prove cover and a locking mechanism. Official notice is given that these features are well known in the art of electrical connectors. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide these features because these would provide a means to secure and protect the probe as is well known in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

29. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Brickett, Beaman et al. and Smith also read on the independent claims.

### ***Double Patenting***

30. Applicant is advised that should claims 1-10 be found allowable, claims 11-30 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).



Art Unit: 2839

***Contact Information***

29. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

**Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (receptionist)  
2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (703) 308-0977.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild, can be reached at (703) 308-2710. The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9318 (general) and (703) 872-9319 for after-final.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or processing should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



**Chandrika Prasad**  
Patent examiner  
August 11, 2003